

U.S. Appln. No. 10/671,706
Attorney Docket No. 0630-1851P
Page 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 17 have been amended and claim 14 has been canceled. Claims 1, 6 and 17 are independent claims. No new matter has been introduced.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zintel in view of Cho et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to further recites, among other features, a network transmission judging unit configured to compare the read network transmission possible identifier with a preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in a transmission judgment table, to judge whether to perform network transmission of the device characteristic data according to a result of the comparison, and to transmit the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in the transmission judgment table. Independent claims 6 and 17 have been amended to include similar features in a varying scope.

U.S. Appln. No. 10/671,706
Attorney Docket No. 0630-1851P
Page 10

Zintel discloses how a User Control Point and UPnP controlled devices communicate in a UPnP network, and discloses adding an adaptor that can convert the device control protocol communications from the peer devices into a host/peripheral protocol for controlling the peripheral devices. In Zintel, User Control Points initiate discovery and communication with Controlled Devices, and receive Events from Controlled Devices (see col. 7, lines 9-12 of Zintel). The table in column 14 of Zintel describes the modules in the CP and controlled devices along with their functions.

The Office Action correctly states that Zintel does not disclose a network transmission judging unit described in independent claims 1, 6 and 17 that were previously presented (see pages 2-3 of the Office Action). For the similar reasons, Zintel does not disclose a network transmission judging unit configured to compare the read network transmission possible identifier with a preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in a transmission judgment table, to judge whether to perform network transmission of the device characteristic data according to a result of the comparison, and to transmit the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in the transmission judgment table, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6 and 17.

The Office Action further relies on Cho et al. to show that Cho et al. teaches the features that are not disclosed in Zintel. Cho et al. discloses

U.S. Appln. No. 10/671,706
Attorney Docket No. 0630-1851P
Page 11

creating a list of the UPnP devices based on the acquired information from the discovered UPnP devices, and then allows a user to select a specific UPnP device from the device list to be controlled by the user (see col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 13). However, Cho et al. does not teach or suggest transmitting the device characteristic data only when the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit is matched with the preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in the transmission judgment table. Rather, Cho et al. does not set any condition in which the information of the UPnP device is acquired. Further, nowhere in Cho et al. discloses matching the network transmission possible identifier read from the network stream processing unit with the preset network transmission possible identifier recorded in the transmission judgment table. Rather, Cho et al. allows the user to select a device from a device list. Therefore, Zintel, even when combined with Cho et al., fails to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claims 1, 6 and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted amended independent claims 1, 6 and 17, and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

U.S. Appln. No. 10/671,706
Attorney Docket No. 0630-1851P
Page 12

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jun S. Ha (Registration No. 58,508) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC/JSH/jmc